



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/735,645  | 12/16/2003  | Uri Armin            | 1379VAS-US          | 3540             |
| 32964   | 7590        | 05/03/2005           | EXAMINER            |                  |
| DEKEL PATENT LTD., DAVID KLEIN<br>BEIT HAROF'IM<br>18 MENUHA VENAHALA STREET, ROOM 27<br>REHOVOT, 76209<br>ISRAEL |             |                      | COMSTOCK, DAVID C   |                  |
|   |             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|   |             |                      | 3732                |                  |
| DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005   |             |                      |                     |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JP

|                              |                 |              |  |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |
|                              | 10/735,645      | ARNIN ET AL. |  |
|                              | Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |
|                              | David Comstock  | 3732         |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 4-8 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 February 2005 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03 February 2005</u>.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</li> <li>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol> |
|---|---|

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Drawings***

The drawings were received on 03 February 2005. These drawings are accepted.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Branemark (5,171,284).

Branemark discloses a prosthetic device for bone comprising an elastic cushioning element 1 (the joint), formed of material similar to silicon, and mechanical fasteners 4 at the ends thereof (see Figs. 1 and 2 and col. 1, lines 28-29). The fasteners comprise an expandable sleeve member 7, defined by axial slits 8,9, that expand radially (as shown by reference letter B in Fig. 1) upon interaction with bone material, which enters the sleeve and acts to expand it (see Fig. 1 and col. 3, lines 51-62). The device is capable of being inserted into a lumen and of being attached to a facet joint, due to its compact size and its threaded fasteners intended for insertion into bone. The elastic cushioning element 1 is capable of being axially compressed and would necessarily expand radially outward upon the axial movement according to the

Poisson's ratio of the elastic material (Poisson's ratio is the ratio of transverse (or radial) extension to longitudinal (or axial) compression (or vice versa) of materials). Branemark does not explicitly recite that the cushioning element 1 is or can be an elastomer.

However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the cushioning element of an elastomer, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

*In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 4-8 are allowable over the prior art of record.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments--see page 4 (page 1 of Remarks), lines 23-29 and page 5 (page 2 of Remarks), lines 23-27, filed 03 February 2005--with respect to the limitations pertaining to the wedge and the material comprising elastomeric balls, have been fully considered and are persuasive. Accordingly, the rejections pertaining to prior claims 4-6 have been withdrawn.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

However, insofar as it applies to the present rejection, the following is noted.

In response to applicant's argument regarding the cushioning element that is axially compressed and expands radially outwards upon axial movement, etc., a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See *In re Casey*, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 312 F.2d 937, 939, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). Here, as set forth in the rejection, the device, at least *per se*, is capable of performing the claimed use, i.e. being axially compressed thereby expanding radially.

Although now a moot point due to dependency of the relevant claims on an allowable independent claim, the following is noted. Examiner does not agree with Applicant that the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) was improper, as Lundborg (as set forth in the prior rejection) provides ample motivation to provide a prosthetic finger with a joint comprising a coil. It is noted that the test for obviousness is not whether the features of one reference may be bodily incorporated into the other to produce the claimed subject matter but simply what the combination of references makes obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Comstock whose telephone number is (571) 272-4710. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*dc*

D. Comstock  
29 April 2005

*Kevin Shaver*  
KEVIN SHAVER  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700